

Student Learning Outcomes Annual Report Process 2016-17

Instructions for Undergraduate Programs

The Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Annual Report process is a key component of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACSCOC) reaffirmation. The university needs to identify student learning outcomes in its educational programs, assess the extent to which outcomes are achieved, and provide evidence of developing improvement based on analysis of the results (SACSCOC Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.1). **CS 3.3.1.1 is one of the most cited standards for non-compliance by SACSCOC.** New guidelines continue to be developed by SACSCOC increasing expectations on student learning outcomes reporting. Therefore in each reporting cycle changes are made to the process to more clearly and accurately define and align outcomes, measurements and findings and provide evidence of continuous quality improvements. The SLO process continues to evolve as additional refinements are needed in order for UofL to be in full compliance with SACS requirements.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) is charged with the collection and review of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Annual Reports submitted by the chairs/departments heads of the academic programs. Below are the instructions for the completing the 2016-17 SLO Report for undergraduate programs.

Important Information

- **DEADLINE:** IE will need to receive the 2016-17 SLO Reports by **Friday, November 3, 2017.**
- **100% submission of reports is required for compliance with SACS core requirements and comprehensive standards.** These reports are critical to the university's ability to demonstrate institutional effectiveness. Your dean will receive periodic status reports detailing outstanding reports until full compliance is achieved.
- Staff from IE is available to assist you and ensure timely submission of the reports. Please contact Cheryl Gilchrist at 852-8139 or cheryl.gilchrist@louisville.edu if you need assistance.
- Please submit the 2016-17 SLO Report template for undergraduate programs via email to cheryl.gilchrist@louisville.edu

SACS Accreditation

As part of the SACSCOC accreditation for undergraduate programs, UofL needs to document the integrated relationship of our General Education program and a culminating undergraduate experience (CUE) within our undergraduate programs. Although the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) Ideas to Action (i2a) has been institutionalized, we need to continue to provide evidence of our ongoing efforts to assess students' critical thinking. Through our SLO process, the department chairs/heads provide the evidence for these outcomes.

Template Has Detailed Instructions

The template has detailed instructions as well to assist department chairs/heads of undergraduate programs with the alignment needed for each required program goal and its relationship to the SLO, measure, target and finding. It also provides department chairs/heads the opportunity to close the loop and show program improvement where needed through the three-part Action Plan: (1) programs provide their previous action plan (from 2015-16), (2) include an update on improvements made in response to the plan (in 2016-17), and (3) create a new action plan (for 2017-18) based upon the assessment results (from the 2016-17 SLO Report). Please submit your report to IE using the current 2016-17 SLO Report template for the undergraduate program.

Using the 2015-16 Feedback Reports

All chairs/department heads received 2015-16 Feedback Report. If you are a new chair and do not have a copy of the 2015-16 Feedback Report for your department, please contact Cheryl Gilchrist at 852-8139 or cheryl.gilchrist@louisville.edu. These reports were generated utilizing a rubric. The feedback report detailed suggestions for the next reporting cycle to demonstrate the alignment needed for each of the required program goals, its relationship to the SLOs and measures, and documenting improvement to the program based on the findings. The recommended changes identified in the 2015-16 SLO Feedback Report need to be reflected in the 2016-17 SLO Report.

Online (distance) Academic Programs and Off-Site Academic Programs

Current guidelines developed by SACSCOC are expanding expectations on student learning outcomes reporting. Programs marketed as online through the Delphi Center and programs where 50% or more of the program are available offsite will need to be more specific in their SLO reports about the assessment of outcomes for the students enrolled in programs offered either online or at offsite locations. SLO reports will need to show that the learning taking place online or offsite is comparable to the face-to-face components of the program.

In the 2016-17 SLO Report, department chairs/heads will need to identify online (distance) and/or off-site degree program in addition to the traditional on campus program. Department chairs/heads will need to verify whether program goals, SLOs and measures for online academic programs and /or off-site are similar in scope and content to the traditionally delivered counterpart. **If possible, chairs will need to distinguish in the report between on campus, distance, and off-site students and document for each group of students their direct attainment of the outcomes.** If the online (distance) or off-site program is a stand-alone program, a separate report will need to be submitted reflecting the unique program goals and related SLOs and measures.

Certificate Programs

For all **certificate programs**, department chairs/heads are asked to verify whether the certificate can be completed as a “stand alone” or in conjunction with another program. If the **certificate program** can be completed as a “standalone”, a separate SLO annual report is required identifying its specific program goals, SLOs, and measures. If the certificate program is offered in conjunction with another program, the certificate program can be incorporated into the SLO report for the other degree. The goals and SLOs for the certificate need to align with the existing degree program. But a separate SLO report is not needed.

Action Plan

This provides evidence of “closing the loop”, by utilizing the assessment results indicated throughout this SLO report to indicate strategies for continuous program improvement to enhance student learning and the student’s academic experience. In order to truly “close the loop”, a three-year cycle has been incorporated into the SLO reporting process. Programs will need to provide their previous action plan (from 2015-16), include an update on improvements made in response to the plan (in 2016-17), and create a new action plan (for 2017-18) based upon the assessment results (from the 2016-17 SLO Report).

INSTRUCTIONS

Program Mission

The **program mission** is a broad statement of the purpose of the academic unit/program which is linked to UofL’s institutional mission. The mission statement outlines the purpose of the academic unit/program within the context of who it serves and in what ways. Each academic unit/program should have its own mission statement that reflects its contribution to UofL’s institutional mission: <http://louisville.edu/about/>

#1 Competency Related to Major

Program Goal #1

A statement (clearly aligned to the program’s mission) that addresses the distinct body of knowledge students will possess upon completing this program of study.

Student Learning Outcome #1

SLO clearly aligns to Program Goal 1 (above), and describes specific **measurable** knowledge, skills or perceptions to be gained or improved upon completing the program of study.

NOTE: Though you may have multiple outcomes related to this program goal, it is suggested that you limit the number of SLOs. If possible, please only report ONE SLO for which you have the necessary measure, target, and finding. If more than one SLO is needed try to limit to two or maximum three. Again, make sure you have the necessary measure, target, and finding for each of the SLOs.

Measure #1

Clearly aligns to SLO 1 (above) and describes a **direct** assessment measuring how students’ work will be evaluated to determine their level of competency.

- Acceptable: paper, exam, essay, presentation, thesis/dissertation, portfolio, supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation

- NOT acceptable: course grade or course completion. Does not provide the level of granularity needed to assess students' performance for the specific competency related to the SLO.

Be sure to **describe** the criteria used to evaluate the student work and **provide copies of the evaluation materials**, if applicable.

- Acceptable: rubric (with explanation of scale), specific exam questions related to SLO, specific questions from supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation form. **Please include a copy of rubric, evaluation form, etc.**

NOTE: Where appropriate, the same measure may be used for more than one SLO.

An **indirect** measure can be used **in addition** to a direct measure (student opinion survey, satisfaction survey, exit survey, etc.)

Target #1

Clearly aligns to Measure 1 (above) and indicates a specific and appropriate threshold for students' collective performance related to the measure of SLO 1. Be sure to include:

- sampling methodology (e.g. representative sample, whole population) with justification for your choice,
- the total number of students being evaluated (ex. $n = 25$), and
- the percentage (not mean/average) of students expected to achieve a particular threshold (e.g. 90% of students must earn a rating of "adequate" or higher on the designated rubric).

Finding #1

Provide results specified in Measure 1 (above) and indicate whether the intended target/threshold was met. (e.g. 75% of students earned a rating of "adequate" or higher on the designated rubric. Target was not met.)

#2 Competency which builds upon the General Education Curriculum

Program Goal #2

This goal clearly aligns to the program mission statement and addresses how upper-level courses (generally 400-level and above) in your program continue to strengthen either effective communication or cultural diversity (one of the competencies initially gained through the general education curriculum). This is **NOT** to address any 100- or 200-level gen ed courses taught through your department.

Note: Critical thinking will be addressed in section 4: Competency related to Critical Thinking

Student Learning Outcome #2

SLO clearly aligns to Program Goal 2 (above) and describes specific **measurable** knowledge, skills or perceptions related to effective communication or cultural diversity to be strengthened by completing this program of study.

NOTE: Though you may have multiple outcomes related to this program goal, it is suggested that you limit the number of SLOs. If possible, please only report ONE SLO for which you have

the necessary measure, target, and finding. If more than one SLO is needed try to limit to two or maximum three. Again, make sure you have the necessary measure, target, and finding for each of the SLOs.

Measure #2

Clearly aligns to SLO 2 (above) and describes a **direct** assessment measuring how students' work will be evaluated to determine their level of competency.

- Acceptable: paper, exam, essay, presentation, thesis/dissertation, portfolio, supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation
- NOT acceptable: course grade or course completion. Does not provide the level of granularity needed to assess students' performance for the specific competency related to the SLO.

Be sure to **describe** the criteria used to evaluate the student work and **provide copies of the evaluation materials**, if applicable.

- Acceptable: rubric (with explanation of scale), specific exam questions related to SLO, specific questions from supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation form. **Please include a copy of rubric, evaluation form, etc.**

NOTE: Where appropriate, the same measure may be used for more than one SLO.

An **indirect** measure can be used **in addition** to a direct measure (student opinion survey, satisfaction survey, exit survey, etc.)

Target #2

Clearly aligns to Measure 2 (above), and indicates a specific and appropriate threshold for students' collective performance related to the measure of SLO 2. Be sure to include:

- sampling methodology (e.g. representative sample, whole population) with justification for your choice,
- the total number of students being evaluated (ex. n = 25), and
- the percentage (not mean/average) of students expected to achieve a particular threshold (e.g. 90% of students must earn a rating of "adequate" or higher on the designated rubric).

Finding #2

Provide results specified in Measure 2 (above) and indicate whether the intended target/threshold was met. (e.g. 75% of students earned a rating of "adequate" or higher on the designated rubric. Target was not met.)

#3 Competency Related to the Culminating Undergraduate Experience

Program Goal #3

This goal clearly aligns to the program mission statement, describes senior-level applied-learning, addresses the defining features of a culminating undergraduate experience, (CUE) <http://louisville.edu/ideastoaction/about/cue/curriculartoolkit/definingfeatures> and identifies the specific CUE course(s). This should describe an opportunity for students to build upon discipline-specific knowledge and/or critical thinking skills and to apply their emerging skills to solve practical (i.e. real world) problems of increasing complexity.

Student Learning Outcome #3

SLO clearly aligns to Program Goal 3 (above), and describes specific measurable discipline-specific knowledge and/or critical thinking and application of their emerging skills to solve practical (i.e. real world) problems of increasing complexity.

NOTE: Though you may have multiple outcomes related to this program goal, it is suggested that you limit the number of SLOs. If possible, please only report ONE SLO for which you have the necessary measure, target, and finding. If more than one SLO is needed try to limit to two or maximum three. Again, make sure you have the necessary measure, target, and finding for each of the SLOs.

Measure #3

Clearly aligns to SLO 3 (above) and describes a **direct** assessment measuring how students' work will be evaluated to determine their level of competency.

- Acceptable: paper, exam, essay, presentation, thesis/dissertation, portfolio, supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation
- NOT acceptable: course grade or course completion. Does not provide the level of granularity needed to assess students' performance for the specific competency related to the SLO.

Be sure to **describe** the criteria used to evaluate the student work and **provide copies of the evaluation materials**, if applicable.

- Acceptable: rubric (with explanation of scale), specific exam questions related to SLO, specific questions from supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation form. **Please include a copy of rubric, evaluation form, etc.**

NOTE: Where appropriate, the same measure may be used for more than one SLO.

An **indirect** measure can be used **in addition** to a direct measure (student opinion survey, satisfaction survey, exit survey, etc.)

Target #3

Clearly aligns to Measure 3 (above), and indicates a specific and appropriate threshold for students' collective performance related to the measure of SLO 3. Be sure to include:

- sampling methodology (e.g. representative sample, whole population) with justification for your choice,
- the total number of students being evaluated (ex. $n = 25$), and
- the percentage (not mean/average) of students expected to achieve a particular threshold (e.g. 90% of students must earn a rating of "adequate" or higher on the designated rubric).

Finding #3

Provide results specified in Measure 3 (above) and indicate whether the intended target/threshold was met. (e.g. 75% of students earned a rating of "adequate" or higher on the designated rubric. Target was not met.)

#4 Competency Related to Critical Thinking

Program Goal #4

This goal clearly aligns to the program mission statement and addresses the opportunities provided to students for refinement of their critical thinking skills (e.g. problem solving and higher-order thinking) acquired through the program.

Student Learning Outcome #4

SLO clearly aligns to Program Goal 4 (above), and describes specific **measurable** critical thinking skills acquired through the program.

NOTE: Though you may have multiple outcomes related to this program goal, it is suggested that you limit the number of SLOs. If possible, please only report ONE SLO for which you have the necessary measure, target, and finding. If more than one SLO is needed try to limit to two or maximum three. Again, make sure you have the necessary measure, target, and finding for each of the SLOs.

Measure #4

Clearly aligns to SLO 4 (above) and describes a **direct** assessment measuring how students' work will be evaluated to determine their level of competency.

- Acceptable: paper, exam, essay, presentation, thesis/dissertation, portfolio, supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation
- NOT acceptable: course grade or course completion. Does not provide the level of granularity needed to assess students' performance for the specific competency related to the SLO.

Be sure to **describe** the criteria used to evaluate the student work and **provide copies of the evaluation materials**, if applicable.

- Acceptable: rubric (with explanation of scale), specific exam questions related to SLO, specific questions from supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation form. **Please include a copy of rubric, evaluation form, etc.**

NOTE: Where appropriate, the same measure may be used for more than one SLO.

An **indirect** measure can be used **in addition** to a direct measure (student opinion survey, satisfaction survey, exit survey, etc.)

Target #4

Clearly aligns to Measure 4 (above) and indicates a specific and appropriate threshold for students' collective performance related to the measure of SLO 4. Be sure to include:

- sampling methodology (e.g. representative sample, whole population) with justification for your choice,
- the total number of students being evaluated (ex. n = 25), and
- the percentage (not mean/average) of students expected to achieve a particular threshold (e.g. 90% of students must earn a rating of "adequate" or higher on the designated rubric).

Finding #4

Provide results specified in Measure 4 (above) and indicate whether the intended target/threshold was met. (e.g. 75% of students earned a rating of “adequate” or higher on the designated rubric. Target was not met.)

Action Plan

This provides evidence of “closing the loop”, by utilizing the assessment results indicated throughout this SLO report to indicate strategies for continuous program improvement to enhance student learning and the student’s academic experience. In order to truly “close the loop”, a three-year cycle has been incorporated into the SLO reporting process. Programs will need to provide their previous action plan (from 2014-15), include an update on improvements made in response to the plan (in 2015-16), and create a new action plan (for 2016-17) based upon the assessment results (reported for 2015-16).